



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/549,445      | 04/14/2000  | Becki Speakman       | 70015060.02         | 8917             |

7590 07/25/2003

Jennifer H Hammond  
Sonnenschein Nath & Rosenthal  
4520 Main Street  
Suite 1100  
Kansas City, MO 64111

EXAMINER

MOHAMEDULLA, SALEHA R

|          |              |
|----------|--------------|
| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|

1756

DATE MAILED: 07/25/2003

13

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action**

Applicati n N .

09/549,445

Applicant(s)

SPEAKMAN, BECKI

Examiner

Saleha R. Mohamedulla

Art Unit

1756

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears n the cover sheet with the c rrespondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 02 July 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

**PERIOD FOR REPLY** [check either a) or b)]

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 5 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☒ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☒ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
  - (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
  - (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
  - (d) ☒ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.

3. ☒ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): NONE.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☒ will not be entered or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: NONE.

Claim(s) objected to: NONE.

Claim(s) rejected: 1-9.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 10.

8. ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.
10. ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Continuation of 2. NOTE:

The claims have been amended to recite new limitations drawn to the mask being affixed along a predetermined distance of the working surface, where the predetermined distance is a portion of the working surface or the entire working surface where the image can be transferred to the predetermined distance without having to reposition the mask, and that images can include both positive and negative images of the mask. These previously unclaimed limitations change the scope of the claims and therefore, raise new issues which require further consideration and/or search.

In addition, Applicant has added six new claims, while only cancelling four finally rejected claims.

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

Applicant argues that the prior art does not teach or suggest that the mask is affixed along a predetermined distance of the working surface, the predetermined surface being a portion of the working surface or the entire working surface, without repeated application of the mask, and the transferred images can include both positive and negative images of the mask. Applicant's arguments are drawn to previously unclaimed subject matter and therefore, require further consideration and/or search. Also, the 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph rejection of claims 1-9 is overcome by the new language.

Also, the newly proposed claim language would overcome the 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph rejection of claims 1-9.

SRM

7/21/03

  
MARK F. HUFF  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1700